

Outpatient/non-intensive drug treatment (incarceration)

Benefit-cost estimates updated August 2014. Literature review updated December 2012.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [technical documentation](#).

Program Description: This broad category includes less intensive treatment modalities delivered during incarceration. These treatments were generally less intensive outpatient, group counseling, drug education, and relapse prevention.

Benefit-Cost Summary

Program benefits		Summary statistics	
Participants	\$0	Benefit to cost ratio	\$29.40
Taxpayers	\$4,529	Benefits minus costs	\$16,888
Other (1)	\$10,980	Probability of a positive net present value	100 %
Other (2)	\$1,975		
Total	\$17,484		
Costs	(\$596)		
Benefits minus cost	\$16,888		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2013). The economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [technical documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates

Source of benefits	Benefits to				Total benefits
	Participants	Taxpayers	Other (1)	Other (2)	
From primary participant					
Crime	\$0	\$4,529	\$10,980	\$2,273	\$17,783
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$299)	(\$299)
Totals	\$0	\$4,529	\$10,980	\$1,975	\$17,484

We created the two "other" categories to report results that do not fit neatly in the "participant" or "taxpayer" perspectives. In the "Other (1)" category we include the benefits of reductions in crime victimization and the economic spillover benefits of improvement in human capital outcomes. In the "Other (2)" category we include estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Cost Estimates

	Annual cost	Program duration	Year dollars	Summary statistics	
Program costs	\$589	1	2012	Present value of net program costs (in 2013 dollars)	(\$596)
Comparison costs	\$0	1	2012	Uncertainty (+ or - %)	10 %

Estimate provided by the Washington State Department of Corrections.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta analysis. The uncertainty range is used in Monte Carlo risk analysis, described in our [technical documentation](#).

Cumulative Net Cash Flows Over Time (Non-Discounted Dollars)



Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)		Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis					
					First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated		
			ES	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Crime	Primary	8	-0.182	0.001	-0.182	0.050	32	-0.182	0.050	42

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Daley, M., Love C. T., Shepard D. S., Petersen C. B., White K. L., & Hall F. B. (2004). Cost-effectiveness of Connecticut's in-prison substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 39(3), 69-92.
- Dugan J. R., & Everett, R. S. (1998). An experimental test of chemical dependency therapy for jail inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 42(4), 360-368.
- Duwe, G. (2010). Prison-based chemical dependency treatment in Minnesota: An outcome evaluation. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 6(1), 57-81.
- Gransky, L. A., & Jones, R. J. (1995). *Evaluation of the post-release status of substance abuse program participants*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Hughey, R., & Klemke, L. W. (1996). Evaluation of a jail-based substance abuse treatment program. *Federal Probation*, 60(4), 40- 45.
- Porporino, F. J., Robinson, D., Millson, B., & Weekes, J. R. (2002). An outcome evaluation of prison-based treatment programming for substance users. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 37(8-10), 1047-1077.
- Tunis, S., Austin, J., Morris, M., Hardyman, P., & Bolyard, M. (1996). *Evaluation of drug treatment in local corrections (Document No. NCJ 159313)*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Wexler, H. K., Falkin, G. P., & Lipton, D. S. (1990). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuse treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 71-92.

For further information, contact:
(360) 586-2677, Institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 11-09-2014



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.